<u>REMARKS</u>

The rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020176583 to Buttiker in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20060018890 to Hale et al. ("Hale") are respectfully traversed.

First, the disclosures of Buttiker and Hale, taken as a whole, do not suggest Applicants' claimed method for modifying the validity of a certificate. Applicants' respectfully submit that Buttiker appears to only be directed to a process and to an end objective completely distinct from those to which the pending application is directed. In particular, while the pending claims of the present application are directed to a method for modifying online the validity of certificates by users who are registered members of a PKI-based authentication system, Buttiker appears to pertain exclusively to a system, method and token for registering new user to a public-key infrastructure system.

Secondly, the combined disclosures of Buttiker and Hale do not teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a method for modifying validity of a certificate using biometric information in a public-key infrastructure based authentication system that includes accessing a server certificate authority using login information of the user in response to a <u>certificate validity modification request</u> from the user under the condition that he/she is registered as a member in the authentication system. Claim 1 further recites inputting the biometric information for a user authentication through a biometric information input unit in the user system and <u>generating a certificate validity modification request message</u> in response to the <u>certificate validity modification request</u> from the user and sending the imported biometric information in the generated <u>certificate validity modification request</u> message to the certificate authority to request the certificate validity modification online.

The Office Action asserts that the combination of Buttiker and Hale discloses all the features recited in the method of claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

For example, notwithstanding the assertions of the Office Action, nowhere does Buttiker disclose generating "sending the inputted biometric information and the generated certificate validity modification request message to the certificate authority" because nowhere does Buttiker disclose a "certificate validity modification message." The Examiner cites paragraph [00544], however, at this paragraph Buttiker only discloses certificate registration and then issuing, based upon the approved certification request, a certificate containing the user's public key, which is returned to a user's token. First, Applicants respectfully submit that a "certification request," as requested by Buttiker's user is distinct from a "certificate validity modification message," as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, The Examiner acknowledges that Buttiker fails to disclose generating a certificate validity modification request message in response to the certificate validity modification request from the user; and sending the inputted biometric information and the generated certificate validity modification request message to the certificate authority to request the certificate validity modification online, and relies upon Hale, citing paragraphs [0012] and [0019]-[0020] and Fig. 2 item 206, to remedy the deficiencies of Buttiker. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

At the cited paragraphs, Hale appears to only disclose a method of <u>local due diligence</u> for accepting certificates. As Hale appears to pertain exclusively to local due diligence, no certificate validity modification request is ever generated or transmitted to a certificate authority. Accordingly, Hale fails to remedy the deficiencies of Buttiker.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied art fails to disclose the method as recited in claim 1.

Independent claim 1 pertains to method performed on a user system for modifying validity of a certificate using biometric information, while independent claim 3 pertains to a method performed on a system in communication with the user system. As such, claim 3 recites receiving from a user system a certificate validity modification request. Similar to the argument presented above, the combination of Buttiker and Hale fails to disclose a certificate validity modification request, let alone receiving such a request message.

Claim 2 and 4-15 depend variously from these independent claims and are likewise patentable over the applied art for at least their dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for the additional features it/they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-15 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP

/Yoon S Ham/
Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: July 12, 2007